India

FOR THE

No. 124. New Series.
No. 218. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MAY 18, 1900.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 233
"Very like Nonsense" 236
The Cawnpore Riots 237
Our London Letter 238
Notes from Bombay 239
The Famine in India:
5,579,000 on Relief 240
The Mansion House Fund 240
The *Investors' Review* Fund 240
Indian Affairs in Parliament:
Special Report 240
The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: The Minority Report 242
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 243
Advertisements 244

NOTES AND NEWS.

CONTRIBUTIONS in aid of the famine-stricken sufferers in India are reported from widely distant centres. "A citizens' movement has been inaugurated" in New York, and "the committee propose to communicate with all the cities of the United States, the secular and religious Press of the United States and Canada, and the Churches and religious organisations everywhere with a view to attracting public attention and awakening public sympathy." Berlin has subscribed nearly £25,000. The king of Siam has sent 5,000 rupees to the Viceroy (who has himself given another 4,000 rupees, bringing his own and Lady Curzon's donations up to 15,000 rupees). We have heard no more of Canada's proposed contribution, but the New Zealand Government has decided to give £5,000. Meantime the British Funds advance with painful slowness. Mr. William Rathbone, a prominent citizen of Liverpool and late M.P. for Carnarvonshire, challenges the beneficence of "those who ought to lead" by offering to "follow to the extent of £1,000," and expresses the wish "to stir up the consciousness that when we are extending our Empire we should not placard our unworthiness by shamefully neglecting that enormous part of it for which we are already, and have been for so many years, responsible." The words are strong, but "they express a very deliberate and decided opinion," with which many of us thoroughly agree. But Lord George Hamilton, who is "watching carefully," with an appearance of more wisdom than ever man possessed, calmly refuses to go beyond the limit he marked out six weeks ago—"to make advances to the rayat and the cultivator, and so enable him to buy seed and stock, that he may once more, when the famine is over, be set upon his legs." How many will have no legs to be set upon! There is only too much truth in the vicious gibe of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* that "it must shame and humiliate every serious Englishman to see how foreign nations are taking over the most urgent duty that devolves upon his country."

Lord George Hamilton again defined the limits of his beneficence—highly contingent beneficence—at a dinner given to Lord Sandhurst by the Northbrook Society at the Imperial Institute (May 9). Lord Sandhurst "suggested to the Government whether a grant either to the Indian Government or the Mansion House Fund could not be made for the express purpose of the cattle question." The question was received with acclamation, and Lord George Hamilton in reply repeated the qualified and hesitating statement he had made in the House in the debate on Sir William Wedderburn's motion more than a month before. Throughout the country resolutions are being passed in favour of a National contribution, and even Reuter's Simla correspondent telegraphs (May 15) that, under the terrible accounts of the distress, "the feeling is growing here that the British Government might well make a special grant in relief." The only substantial reason that Lord George Hamilton has yet advanced is that, if a grant were made, Parliament would be undertaking the duty of private charity and drying the fountains of individual sympathy. This is a curious argument to come from a Secretary of State who has shown himself so backward in appealing to private charity. But surely, if there is one course more likely than another to check private benevolence, it is precisely Lord George Hamilton's—to announce that the Government will supply the lack of public subscriptions. On the other hand, a substantial Parliamentary contribution to the Mansion House Fund would not only satisfy the national sense of duty, encourage the famine-stricken milllions, and silence the detraction of the world, but also give the needed impulse to public charity by a notable proof of the urgent needs of our starving fellow-subjects. The proposal is in no way open to Lord George's objection, whereas his own substitute for it seems admirably calculated to incur the very danger he professes to fear.

The Secretary of State for India will no doubt have read with interest the article entitled "A Wordy Minister," in the Anglo-Indian *Englishman* of April 5. It opens thus:—

> There is about Lord George Hamilton a more airy irresponsibility even than resides in the philosophic doubt of Mr. Balfour. This is not only irritating, because Lord George Hamilton is not nearly so able a man as the First Lord of the Treasury, but it is dangerous, because chance has placed the noble lord in a position unrivalled in the opportunities it presents to enlightened statesmanship for good, and to mediocrity for harm. . . . . The history of India during the last five years shows that few Secretaries of State have had greater opportunities of serving this Dependency than the present Minister, and that no Secretary of State has more recklessly flung these opportunities away. . . . . His latest speech in the House of Commons (April 3) reveals the Secretary of State in his characteristic attitude of flippant aloofness from the hard facts of the situation in India.

This is hard measure from a Government supporter: "airy irresponsibility," "irritating," and "dangerous"; "mediocrity"; "recklessly flinging away opportunities of serving India"; "his characteristic attitude of flippant aloofness from the hard facts." But the *Englishman* rubs in the salt resolutely, exemplifying its complaints through a long and strong article. We do not in the least wish to cite this drastic handling of Lord George Hamilton as a plain-spoken confirmation of our own criticisms; but we do regard it as a valuable example of proper protest against a high public official who so grievously fails the country in a time when there arises the gravest need for the wisest and most sympathetic guidance within the powers of statesmanship.

The special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, writing from Gujerat on April 17, concludes his letter with a sentence that sums up a number of our recent contentions. He says:—

> If in the meantime (that is, by the time the rayat is set on his feet again after the famine) it is realised here and at home that the land question and the debt question and the revenue question, which are all one, can wait no longer, and it is decided to apply remedies without thought of anything but the relief of the rayat, and without being frightened at the cost, we may begin to get at the roots of the Indian famine.

The awful condition of the country may be imagined from the correspondent's remark that "the question that crosses and comes back to mind after a course of famine travel is whether any great hope of recovery is left." This is a sufficiently severe commentary on the rejoicings in the British Press over the "elasticity" and "prosperity" of India. We note that he is "inclined to rate very high the widespread hope that Lord Curzon's administration is exciting amongst all classes." The misfortune is that behind Lord Curzon stands Lord George Hamilton, with all the mischievous and dangerous traditions of the India Office, "watching carefully" lest the British public should catch a glimpse of the skeletons in the cupboards.

"The first thing," writes the correspondent, "that must strike an observer as he goes about the country is the lack of staying power shown by the cultivating classes." That is the very point on which Sir William Wedderburn's motion (April 3) turned, when the Secretary of State made

the speech that stirred the reflections of the *Englishman* to frank revolt. The correspondent goes on to say :—

He sees them (the cultivating classes)—or, in other words, he sees India—living on the brink of ruin without reserves of cash or kind or credit, and he asks himself how it is that a generation of railways and more than a generation of trading with the West find the people touching bottom, with nothing, and less than nothing, to show for all the exports and imports and internal development.

The new commerce, he remarks, has gone far to rob the country of its ancient industries, and thrown the people back upon the land. The new finance, too, "has robbed the people of a quarter of their savings by depreciating the value of the silver ornaments which fill the place of the Post Office Savings Bank at home." The rayat is hard-working and frugal, and yet the lack of three half-pence a day in famine times drives him to the relief works. "From the Imperial point of view, this lack of staying power ought, one would think, to be a matter of some concern." Really one would think so, especially during an apotheosis of Imperialism; but officialdom thinks otherwise, and the facts cannot easily be got to the minds of the British public.

Remarking on "the desperate pass to which the country has come," the correspondent points out again that "the word has gone forth," in the Bombay Presidency at least, "that every rupee of revenue which can be collected shall be swept into the Treasury"; and "yet, after all," he says, "this policy is only the logical outcome of the British revenue system." The only flaw in the official argument is the practical fact "that the rayat cannot pay," or, "at any rate, does not pay."

The man who pays is the bunya, who is getting the land into his hands as his return. Nothing can be clearer than that our revenue system, coupled with the right we gave the rayat of mortgaging and alienating his land, has become a mighty engine of expropriation. The bunya is indispensable to this Government—anyone will tell you that—in his capacity of advancer of revenue. But when the lord-high-raiser-of-the-wind to the Government of India comes upon the scene as the landlord, with the man who once upon a time was a rayat as his tenant or labourer, he appears in a less desirable light. What seems to me to be as plain as Indian daylight is that when the wheel comes full circle the resisting power of the cultivator has gone, and a famine can be declared almost at any time. And the wheel is coming round fast.

Here is food for thought, especially for those of us that still indulge the official fancy that all is right with India. The correspondent brushes aside the venerable charge of extravagance against the rayat, as the Deccan Riots Commission did a quarter of a century ago. Then he deals with the essential point of the substitution of the iron law of a fixed tribute for the earlier law of payment according to crops, with the inevitable result of driving the people to borrow. "This inflexible tribute system," he points out, "is the nether millstone, and the gathering burden of indebtedness the upper millstone, with which we are grinding India." The position of the Indian—that is, the rayat—is this: "The British Raj and the Bunya Raj eat up his crops, and what one leaves the other devours." No wonder the correspondent gloomily wonders "whether any great hope of recovery is left."

The *Pioneer* considers that the London newspapers in search for an explanation of the smallness of the Indian Famine Fund need seek no further than their own ridiculous comments on the Indian Budget. The *Times* finds that the Budget indicates "a remarkable and most gratifying elasticity," and demonstrates "the growing prosperity of the country." The *Standard* sees in it "the marvellous recuperative power of the vast dependency "and the *Daily News* considers it "a remakable tribute to the elastic resources of the country." And all the time the cattle are dying by the thousand and the country is in danger of permanent impoverishment. The most that can be said for the Budget is that India has just managed to scrape through with only a small loan because of certain happy accidents, such as the absence of troops in South Africa and the failure of the opium crop in China, and because of the starvation of the provincial treasuries and "the retention of taxation up to a limit that leaves us no reserve to draw upon."

Lord Welby, Sir Ralph Knox, and Mr. Ryder sign the first of the "reservations" appended to the Final Report on the Indian Expenditure Commission. They "regret greatly that the Commission decline to recommend the creation in India of a Comptroller and Auditor-General detached from, and independent of, the Executive Government, whose financial acts he audits." They "are convinced that the complete independence of the auditor is essential to a truly efficient audit system," and are of opinion that until this is established "the audit system of India is and will be gravely defective." The existing plan is "wrong in principle." Lord Welby and his friends meet the objections alleged—the cost, the absence of irregularities, and difference between England and India. The check on expenditure, they point out, "would more than compensate the cost." The plea that there is no evidence of irregularities "is equivalent to the cat's assurance that the cream is safe." It is a new theory that "the principle upon which an audit is conducted varies with the temperature." The criticism is thoroughly well-grounded. The essential point, of course, is the safeguarding of the Indian taxpayers :—

The bureaucracy in India is a noble service of the highest character, but its character is not higher than that of the services at home, and it is difficult to assign a reason why the safeguard of a vigilant control should be less complete in India than it is in England.

Lord Welby's reasons for independent audit apply throughout the whole field of Indian administration. The bureaucracy requires control in the interests of the people; and there is no control whatever. The Secretary of State is absolute ruler, and officials can do no wrong so long as public scandal is avoided. The great "Imperial" purpose of officialdom is to prevent public criticism. No system, however "noble," in personnel, could stand such a strain.

Justices Prinsep and Hardley, sitting in the Calcutta High Court, have had before them the case of Mr. Sibold, who was sentenced by the Deputy-Magistrate of Ranchi to a fine of Rs. 1,000 for assaulting an old man who had refused to salaam him and his companion, and who died shortly afterwards. At an early stage of the appeal Mr. Justice Prinsep announced that the court considered Mr. Sibold accountable for the man's death. As to justification, even Mr. Sibold's counsel did not venture to insist that his client had a right to force the man to dismount from his horse in order to salaam. In giving judgment the court said :—

Having regard to Sibold's position as a District Engineer and a Government Officer, it was especially incumbent on him, out of respect for that position, if not from feelings of self-restraint, to abstain from assault on a Native.

The court held that the assault was unprovoked, and sentenced Sibold to four months' simple imprisonment as well as to the Rs. 1,000 to which he had already been sentenced by the magistrate.

Much to the disgust of the *Pioneer* and Anglo-Indians generally, the Government of India instead of letting the Chupra scandal fall into oblivion, has made it the subject of a Resolution. The Governor-General in Council declares that Mr. Corbett's conduct in assaulting Narsingh Singh was lacking in any justification, and he goes on to say :—

In judging of his conduct, moreover, it is impossible to forget the fact that he was an English officer of Government; and that the position of such officers imposes upon them a very special responsibility towards the inhabitants of the country, in whose eyes they represent, each according to his degree, the Government of her Majesty.

But the really serious element in the case lies in the proceedings which followed the original quarrel. The Governor-General believes that the conduct of Messrs. Bradley and Corbett, in laying a complaint against Narsingh Singh to put pressure upon him, amounted "to little short of persecution, and was a flagrant abuse of the authority with which as police officers they were entrusted." Mr. Twidell's conduct is let off with such epithets as unwise, improper and indiscreet, but there follows a very important remark :—

The question of the union of judicial and executive functions is now under the consideration of the Government of India, and is one upon which much discussion has already been expended. It will be conceded, however, by all parties that when the two functions are united in the same hands it behoves those who exercise them to abstain, not only from any abuse, but also from any semblance of abuse of the powers thus conferred upon them, and to avoid with the most scrupulous care, any action that may give reasonable ground for the allegation that the objects of the executive are improperly permitted to influence the independence of the judicial branch of the administration.

And what is this but an official declaration of the difficulties and dangers that spring from the union of judicial and executive functions?

It is somewhat of an anti-climax to find that the resolution then goes on to confirm the trivial punishments inflicted by the Bengal Government. Mr. Twidell is to be debarred from promotion for one year, and the promotion of Mr. Corbett is not to be confirmed for the same period, while Mr. Bradley and the Moulvi Zakir Hossein are to be admonished. But there is still another point, which is much more serious. Not only are the "persecutors" of Narsingh Singh who defiled the font of justice to receive this light punishment, but the upright and fearless magistrate, who set free the guilty and exposed the whole foul scandal to the world, is to be blamed because forsooth he did not exercise sufficient "discretion" when face to face with this hideous iniquity. Mr. Pennell, throwing aside all the bias of race and position, had the courage to remove a foul stain from British justice, and because he did not mince his words, nor measure them to suit the criticisms of colder hearts, this is his reward.

The reconstitution of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and its possible future amalgamation with the House of Lords as a judicial body will be regarded with interest in India in view of the deep dissatisfaction with Indian appeals. Mr. Chamberlain, in his speech on the Australian Commonwealth Bill (May 14), said:—

What we propose, pending further consideration which must be given to any greater scheme, is to appoint for seven years a representative from each of these Colonies and India, to be members of the Privy Council, who shall also act during that period as Lords of Appeal, and upon whom will be conferred life peerages so that they may continue to sit in the House of Lords although they will not act as Judges after the time of their service has expired. It may be that those services will be renewed, and provision may be taken to renew them if thought desirable. The Judges so appointed will be paid the same salaries as the Lords of Appeal are now paid, and payment will be made at the cost of the Imperial Parliament.

The Bill to effect this purpose will, we understand, be introduced on Monday next in the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor. The experience of recent years has shown that India is most inadequately represented on the Judicial Committee. It seems perfectly plain that the renovated Court should contain the best Native lawyer that India can send over. A retired Chief Justice, with all reasonable industry, cannot possibly enter into the law of India in such an intimate manner as a Native Indian; and there is not the slightest difficulty in finding a Native lawyer who is fully competent for the post. We earnestly trust that no mistake will be made over this important appointment.

Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., has received the following letter from the Viceroy of India to whom he presented a copy of his metrical translation of the *Ramayana* published this year:—

Viceroy's Camp, Lahore,
April 25, 1900.

DEAR MR. DUTT,

Let me thank you for the very dainty companion volume to that which I already possess. It has reached me by the last mail. The presentation of these ancient epics in a readable and therefore a condensed form, to European readers, is in the nature of a public service. It acquaints English students with a good many of the bases of Indian history, thought, religion and *life*; and helps to strip off the mask from the mysterious and sometimes almost unintelligible features of the past.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) CURZON.

An Indian correspondent writes from Durban on April 14:—"Perhaps in reading the accounts published from day to day of the Boer war, you have followed the movements of the Indian community in connexion with it in so far as they have been chronicled by the newspapers. But I am also aware that the Press has not been able to give anything like a full account of the doings of the Indians in South Africa. I need hardly say that as soon as war was declared, irrespective of their opinions as to the justness or otherwise of the war, the Indians to a man made up their minds to give their humble support to the British Government during the crisis; and as the immediate result of this sentiment an extremely well attended meeting of the English-speaking Indians of Durban was held, and as many as could signed there and then a declaration offering their services to the military authorities unconditionally and without pay to do any work that they may be considered fitted for, especially mentioning the field hospital and commissariat departments, and recording the fact that they did not know the use of arms.

"The offer was ultimately accepted in connexion with the Indian Ambulance Corps which at the instance of the military authorities was formed in Natal. The bearers for the corps consisted mostly of indentured Indians supplied by the estates in Natal, through the Protector's department, and through the above mentioned volunteers who were to act as leaders of the stretcher parties of bearers, the Indians being perfectly free either to go to the battlefield or not. Thus about 1,000 Indian bearers, and thirty leaders (no more of the latter being really necessary), carried the wounded after the battle of Colenso, and by their arduous work commanded the admiration of all concerned and more than satisfied the patients themselves. It was freely acknowledged by the European Superintendent of the corps and other Europeans who came with it that without the leaders the carrying could not be done with satisfaction. The corps, having been formed only for the advance to Ladysmith through Colenso, was disbanded after the reverse, and was re-formed when General Buller tried to force a passage through Spion Kop.

"The nature of the work this time was if possible more exacting and undoubtedly more risky. The Indians, contrary to the announcement that they were to work without the range of fire had to fetch the wounded from within the range, at times shells falling within hardly 100 yards of them, all this of course being unavoidably due to the unexpected reverse at Spion Kop and retirement from Vaal Krantz. The bearers and the leaders had to march with their charge a distance of twenty-five miles, from Spearman's Camp to Frere, over the Natal roads which, as you are aware, are very rough and hilly, at one time doing a distance of over 125 miles in a week. Moreover our Indian merchants supplied cigarettes, etc., for the wounded, which was quite a feature of the Indian corps. Many Europeans who ought to know have told me that no European ambulance corps could cover the distance of twenty-five miles, carrying the wounded under such difficult circumstances, in a single day, which our Indian bearers and their leaders did in the face of serious difficulties about food and shelter.

"Not being satisfied with this work, and in order that our merchants may be still more effectively identified with the patriotic feeling, and in order to show that we were quite capable of sinking our local differences at a time of common danger, a substantial fund to the amount of £65 was collected by them and handed over to the Durban Women's Patriotic League, which is a local organisation for supplying medical comforts to the wounded soldiers and volunteers, some of the latter being violently anti-Indian colonists. Our Indian ladies prepared handkerchiefs and pillow-cases out of cloth supplied by our merchants for the wounded. All the Indian refugees, counting thousands, have been entirely supported by the Indian community—a feat that has elicited from the Mayor of Durban a public acknowledgment of gratefulness, and this fact becomes the more important in view of what is going on at present. The Refugee Relief Committee find it very difficult to adequately maintain even the European refugees. The central committee in London has cabled withdrawing the support hitherto given as well to the able-bodied men as to the women and infirm men. When the welcome news of the relief of Kimberley and Ladysmith was received the Indians, side by side with the Europeans, marked their sense of joy by closing their shops, decorating their stores, etc. They also held a public meeting. Sir John Robinson, who was the first Premier of Natal under responsible government, was invited to preside for the occasion, which invitation the hon. gentleman very kindly accepted. The meeting was a brilliant success, and was attended by about 1,000 Indians representing all parts of the colony, and over sixty leading Europeans."

The following account is given on the authority of the *Tribune*. Major H. G. Morris, travelling from Cawnpore to Calcutta, wanted at Naihati Station to see the Station Master. Moti Lal, a goods clerk, who was asked the whereabouts of that official, said that he was in his office. But the gallant Major failed to find him there, so he came back and belaboured the goods clerk with his stick. Moti Lal is said to have brought a charge of assault against Major Morris.

"VERY LIKE NONSENSE."

When the Viceroy's telegraphic summary of the Indian Budget came over at the end of March it was conceived in terms that gave the note to the chorus of applauders in the British Press. The *Times* saw in it "a remarkable and most gratifying elasticity" and "growing prosperity of the country." The *Standard*, with reminiscences of Lord George Hamilton's optimistic phraseology, declared that the Budget gave evidence of the "marvellous recuperative power of the vast Dependency." Even the *Daily News* was put off its guard and declared the alleged results to constitute a "remarkable tribute to the elastic resources of the country and to the skill with which they are administered." This reputed "elasticity" was no doubt very comforting to those of us that lull themselves in the illusions of official complacency. We ourselves (March 30) sounded a note of warning, and expressed the hope that, until the full statement of the facts was available, "the benevolent public here would hold the figures in deep distrust, and not allow them to affect the Mansion House and other famine relief funds." We do not always see eye to eye with the *Pioneer*, but now and again our contemporary's patience is overstrained, and then it is apt to speak out frankly as if it had been studying our columns. For example, take this outburst (March 30, weekly edition):—

> The *Times* in its criticisms of the Indian Budget has hit upon the one comment which is absolutely wide of the mark. Whatever the figures of the revised estimates for the current year and the estimates for the coming year may be taken to show, they cannot with any propriety of language be held to prove "elasticity" in the Indian revenues.

The *Pioneer*, the good friend of the Government, proceeds to give reasons for its flat contradiction of the inference of the *Times*. Then it makes further sagacious reflections on the judgment of Printing House Square. "To speak in these circumstances of the salient feature of the Financial Statement being its exhibition of the 'elasticity' of the Indian revenues is very like nonsense." Further, naturally, "the *Times*' comment can only serve to mislead English readers." Precisely so. The *Pioneer* accordingly confirms our own view, and in the rôle of candid friend pronounces the theory of "elasticity" of the Indian revenues, advanced so triumphantly by eminent contemporaries, to be, in plain terms, misleading nonsense.

Our "elastic" contemporaries would do well to regard the *Pioneer's* argument—an argument urged by many other Indian papers—with some attention. Let them consider more closely the "principal revenue heads"—the heads under which Government derives its revenues as a tax-imposing power—leaving aside the revenues coming from such quasi-commercial enterprises as railways and canals, post office and telegraph. Let them ponder over the striking variations under salt, stamps, excise, and customs, and especially over the two principal heads of revenue and opium. The Budget estimate of land revenue for 1899-1900—which proved a most untoward year, with no rainfall and widespread famine—was placed higher than the actual income of 1898-99, a year of normal rainfall and comparative comfort to the agriculturists—that is, the *Indu-Prakash* reminds us, to the mass of the population. The figures were reduced by about a million and a-quarter sterling in the revised estimates, the deficit representing shorter collections and remissions. The causes of this deficit were still, as the *Indu-Prakash* points out, actively in operation in March last; indeed the distress from famine was steadily growing more intense; and yet the Budget estimate for 1900-1 was fixed at less than £400,000 under the Budget estimate for the preceding year, £837,900 higher than the revised estimate of that year, and practically at the figures of a normal year. And on what grounds? Because, Mr. Dawkins said, "it is hoped that famine will have disappeared by the end of next September." On such a slender basis has this confident Budget been reared—and that too in the face of the recent experience of the last famine, which, though then the worst of the century, has been far exceeded in severity by the famine now raging. The argument of the *Pioneer*, though less elaborate than that of the *Indu-Prakash*, is practically identical. "The only revenue head which has assisted the Government in the present emergency," the *Pioneer* goes on to show, "is that from opium, which in the two years is expected to show a continuous improvement amounting in all to close on a million sterling." This looks well; but our contemporary penetrates below the surface, pointing out that "an expert like the Director-General of Statistics" has warned the Government that the opium revenue "is doomed to eventual extinction," and noting the admission of the Finance Minister that the course of prices (on the rise in which the increment in the coming year depends) is "very difficult to forecast." Here, again, is an ominously slender support for a large element of revenue in a Budget that with difficulty compiles a formal surplus of only £160,300. The "other heads" of revenue—income tax, registration, etc.—are practically stationary, but on the wrong side; "they dropped £100,000 this year, and are expected to recover £59,000 next"—a bold bid for recovery of half the loss. "Apart from opium, so far as increased receipts go," says the *Pioneer*, "the Government has mainly to thank the stimulus given to railway traffic by famine"—a sufficiently melancholy source of profit—"the effect of which is not expected to be maintained, and the profits on coinage of silver." But, after all, "Mr. Dawkins would never have been able to square accounts with a loan of three crores had roads and buildings not been cut down to the tune of £800,000 in two years, and had the Boers not kept a large contingent of the Indian forces so long employed in South Africa, thus saving the Government of India, directly or indirectly, something like a million sterling in the two years." From such criticisms—criticisms by a semi-official journal, not by a political adversary—the British public will be able to judge whether or not the boast of "elasticity" of the Indian revenues is not "very like nonsense." We shall be interested to observe the *Times*' reply to the *Pioneer's* charge that its "comment can only serve to mislead English readers."

The pressure of the famine has naturally led most of the Indian journals to deal more specifically with the new arrangements as to the Famine Insurance Fund. Hitherto it has been the practice to place under the head of "Reduction of Debt" so much of the grant as may not have been expended on famine relief or on works classed as protective. "As a matter of fact," the friendly Anglo-Indian *Statesman* explains, "the unappropriated balance has been spent upon, or charged against, public works not classed as protective, the effect ostensibly being to reduce to a corresponding extent the amount which it has been necessary to borrow for such works." This practice will still continue; but the head of "Reduction of Debt" will be changed to "Reduction or Avoidance of Debt". The object is to remove public misapprehension! The *Statesman* offers two main objections to Mr. Dawkins's reasoning. First: "The theory that a given sum from the Famine Grant expended upon particular public works represents so much debt avoided is tenable only on the assumption that the works would have been executed if the sum in question had not been available; and it is not by any means clear that this is a legitimate assumption." Again: "Assuming that the Government, having spent a given sum from the Famine Grant on certain non-protective works, is really so much better off than it would otherwise have been—that is, that is has incurred so much less debt than it would otherwise have incurred—it by no means necessarily follows that it is in a correspondingly better position to the cost of famine"—unless on Mr. Dawkins's assumption that "the credit of the Government would be higher when it was compelled to borrow." But, "not only is it not correct," argues the *Statesman*, "it is absurd, to contend that money which has been spent is a fund in being because otherwise an equivalent amount of additional debt would have been incurred; and a policy which rests on such a theory must be largely fallacious." Just so. But this is the traditional theory all the same. The *Pioneer* argues in similar strain. Mr. Dawkins's change, it says, "will make little difference to the credit of the Government;" and if the Public Works is so admirable that it is worth while adding so much a year to the taxation, "why not debit it accordingly and let the accounts show the fact?" The contention is perfectly just. The biting scorn of the candid *Pioneer* is tolerably instructive. "The utility of maintaining a misnamed Famine Grant to serve the purposes of a sort of spurious Sinking Fund," it says, "is extremely doubtful. The whole thing is apt to become a juggle with which the Government of India delude themselves and the public." Let the public take notice.

We refer again to the strong contentions of Mr. Bose, Mr. Charlu, the Mahárájá of Darbhanga, and Mr. Mehta

on the oppressive assessments responsible for the deplorable condition of the rayats only to note that Mr. Ibbetson acknowledged that "there is hardly any question which has a more intimate bearing upon the prosperity of agriculture in India," and that "it has not been overlooked by the Government of India." We shall look anxiously for the announcement of the Government's practical conclusions. Meantime the friends of the rayats—that is, of the solid prosperity of the country—may take courage from this indication of the efficiency of active and well-grounded remonstrance. We can only briefly note the incisive comments of such journals as the *Indu-Prakash* and the *Hindu* on the real test of a prosperity budget, in sharp demonstration of the fictitious character of this "elasticity" budget. The *Indu-Prakash* points out that the limits of taxation had admittedly been already reached when resort was had to the manipulation of the currency. "The absurdity," it points out, "becomes more glaring when we remember that out of our total revenue of forty-four million and odd pounds sterling from revenue heads proper . . . . fully sixteen million (that is, about two-fifths) comes from land (that is, from that which has suffered most by the famine) and about six crores (that is, a seventh more) comes from the salt tax, which presses hard on those who are the primary and the greatest sufferers by the famine." And "now for a period of three years," says the *Hindu*, "the demands of currency reform have absorbed the surplus, much to the benefit of the foreign merchant exploiting the resources of the country, while the taxes originally intended to meet special and temporary objects, and taxes admitted to be unjust and intolerable and to have the first claim on surplus revenues for remission, continue to be exacted with the same rigour from the starving people." And the *Daily News*, of all Imperialists, joins with the *Times* in telling us that this budget is a "remarkable tribute to the elastic resources of the country and to the skill with which they are administered". It is, indeed, "very like nonsense."

THE CAWNPORE RIOTS.

THERE are many reasons for carefully noting the scenes that have lately been enacted at Cawnpore. In some ways the Cawnpore riots are a turning point both in the method of fighting plague and in the method of putting down disorder, and certainly the conduct of the people was curiously compounded of turbulence and moderation, of wild licence and fixed determination. It is true that this was not the first trouble caused by the enforcement of unpopular plague regulations. Our readers will remember the great riots in Bombay, and the many disturbances in Bengal and Behar; nor will they have forgotten the unfortunate peasants shot down at Garshankar in the Punjab. But here at Cawnpore the circumstances were very peculiar; some of the most ominous characteristics of the former troubles were found in an exaggerated form, with other new ones beside. Nor does it detract from the interest of the case that it has added fresh lustre to the illustrious career of Sir Antony MacDonnell, and that his conduct is applauded by all sections of the people alike. When a Governor fails we are assured that it is no fault of his own, that he has fallen on evil times which could be set right by no statesmanship. The career of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, tried alike by prosperity and adversity, is the best answer to such lame excuses. Judged alike by his own countrymen and by the people of India, he has shown himself able to deal successfully with a problem of the greatest difficulty and, triumphing over adverse circumstances, to ensure the peace and safety of a great city. All agree that one false move would have ruined the situation. Sir Antony saved it.

Now there are four points in this tragic business which deserve our special attention: (1) the union of Moslems and Hindus throughout the business; (2) the curious self-control exhibited by a mob, which yet was guilty of such terrible violence; (3) the strong feeling against plague regulations, though far milder in Cawnpore than in many other parts, as well as the hatred of the police; and (4) the universal congratulations showered on the Lieutenant-Governor for concessions which under other circumstances many would have been inclined to treat as signs of degrading weakness. It is difficult to avoid the inference that the first of these had much to do with the last, and that it was the union of the people rather than their violence which reconciled even the stiff-necked to a policy of concession. It is not so very long ago since such scenes of violence were unknown in Indian cities, and when they first began, it was rather in consequence of the feuds of one section of the population with another than of any grievances against the ruling race. It has even been alleged that these internal disputes were viewed with some complacency by small-minded officials who thought that the maxim *divide et impera* was the expression of the highest statecraft. But that their turbulence has now found another object and one which, far from dividing, unites the people is too evident to be longer gainsaid.

The self-control of the mob is even more strange than the unwonted union shown by its diverse elements. The segregation camp was furiously attacked, the police constables were butchered and thrown into the flames, possibly before life was extinct; but then, unlike all other mobs, the wreckers after having tasted blood stayed their hands. As the *Pioneer* says:—

> We hear of no promiscuous wrecking of property, no outrages upon isolated Europeans. Instead of this we have a systematic, well-organised boycott, enforced by a secret but powerful scheme of intimidation which was so effective that it not only kept the shops of the bazaar closed but prevented even large English establishments from doing any business, though a temporary famine prevailed and tinned stores might have commanded any price.

Of the "secret but powerful scheme of intimidation" there is indeed no evidence. It is the common explanation given by a ruling race of all movements in which the subject people show unity, determination and discipline. But what, as is clear, especially surprised the European observer was to find a mass of men credulous in the extreme, believing or professing to believe that Government was poisoning the water and burning those afflicted by plague, and yet knowing precisely what it wanted and ready to abandon its resistance as soon as this was fully conceded. Our contemporary says:—

> We have the Mahometan butchers—usually regarded as a class of burly ruffians with no ideas beyond the filling of their stomachs—sending a deputation to the Lieutenant-Governor, and arguing out the question from their own point of view.

Does this look like intimidation and outside pressure? Is it not more reasonable to attribute the unity of the people to the general hostility to the plague measures and the absence of *unmeaning* violence, the readiness to accept terms, to the concentration of all their thoughts and feeling on this one grievance? They were no idle crowd anxious to find any excuse for lawlessness and plunder, but a mass of men united by a deep sense of wrong.

But here there again appears one of the contradictions of the situation. The authorities of the North-West Provinces have always prided themselves on the mild character of their plague regulations. Yet it was in this very Province that so fierce a riot broke out, and such extravagant fictions as to the poisoning of water and the killing of patients passed from mouth to mouth. But it is always necessary to remember in discussing Indian affairs that it is not the high English officials who have to carry out such regulations but the Indian police, and the police, starved that money may be spent in more showy ways, is notorious for its corruption. This is not because Indian officials are naturally corrupt. The Indian officials of the Post Office, for instance, have long had an excellent reputation, and the postal losses through dishonesty in India are less in proportion than in England. But the rigidity of English law and the overwhelming power of English government in India seem to place before the police of that country a temptation which they are unable to resist. There are ugly stories of the use of plague regulations for the purpose of blackmail, and of a particularly scandalous instance of this being the immediate cause of the outbreak.

The *Pioneer*, chief organ of the Anglo-Indians though it be, does not hesitate to praise Sir Antony for pacifying the city by modifying the plague regulations. Not so long ago such praise in the mouth of an Indian would have been thought to savour of sedition. Our contemporary says:—

> There are of course those who hold that any concession to mob violence is wrong; but we have every reason to believe that the prevalent feeling locally is that Cawnpore owes a great debt of gratitude to the Lieutenant-Governor for his personal action in the matter, and that without his interposition things must have come to a very different termination.

The modifications are important, but it would perhaps be only fair to say that they were due rather to the union, the determination, and the singleness of purpose shown by the people than to their violence. The new regulations were at once accepted as an end to all difficulties, and whereas till Sunday evening the city was in a state of sullen unrest, "within an hour or two of the posting of the proclamation on Monday morning the shops were thrown open, and the place speedily resumed its usual every-day appearance." The changes were, indeed, considerable. They are certain to be acted on throughout the North-West Provinces, and can hardly fail to spread sooner or later to other parts of India. What Cawnpore has refused to submit to, can hardly be enforced elsewhere. It would be to invite riots, to insist in other places on that which has there been withdrawn in consequence of rioting. The *Pioneer* rightly calls the new rules the *Charta of Cawnpore.* In the last number of INDIA a summary was given. The chief alterations are that for the future *punchayats* or committees shall be formed to assist the Health Officers, that a patient may be isolated either in his own or a hired house, in a temporary hut, or in a private caste hospital, instead of being sent to a segregation camp, that those who prefer an Indian doctor shall not be forced to have a European, that *purdah* women should be examined only by female doctors, and that families should not be separated against their will. Thus does Sir Antony MacDonnell, under the persuasion of a riot, fulfil the promise made by Lord Curzon before his departure from England, the promise to respect even the prejudices of the Indians.

As our readers will have judged, there is much in the comments of the *Pioneer* on the Cawnpore riots which secures our assent. We do not, however, see any signs of a great organised conspiracy, and we see still less reason in the attack—we had almost said the usual attack—on educated Indians. The *Pioneer* is pleased that Sir Antony MacDonnell consulted with unofficial Europeans, who often have means of knowing the feelings of the Indians which officials have not. It can hardly deny, therefore, that educated Indians, who have still better means, should also be consulted. But it complains that this class has stood absolutely on one side, either because it has no influence or because it shares in the prejudices of the mob. That it shares sufficiently in the prejudices of the people to be able to understand their feelings is just one of the things that would make its co-operation most valuable. If this co-operation is not given, or is not given as freely as it ought to be, perhaps the fault is not so entirely on the side of the educated Indians as the *Pioneer* would have us believe. They cannot have yet forgotten that the man who was foremost in offering his services during the first plague epidemic at Poona was especially singled out for persecution, slander, and imprisonment without trial. And even if, with the release of the Natus, all memory of that political outrage had passed away they could not forget the contempt with which the aspirations of educated India are treated by their European fellow-subjects. The conduct of the educated Indians is the natural result of this treatment. You cannot expect to have co-operation in the hour of danger, when you want it, and yet refuse it when it is offered in times of peace and prosperity. This is a lesson that Anglo-Indians should lay to heart, or assuredly they will have cause to regret it.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

TWO characteristic performances by Mr. Chamberlain have enlivened the otherwise uneventful proceedings of Parliament this week. On Monday we had the new Imperialist striving to reconcile the behests of the Australian democracy with the reactionary tendencies of British Conservatism, and a day later we were privileged to witness in the hands of the same versatile artist an exposition of the insurgent if parochial Radicalism of Birmingham. Of the two episodes the former was the more important, and the latter, in its personal aspect, the more suggestive. When dealing with the Commonwealth Bill Mr. Chamberlain, by an effort of self-restraint, succeeded in conveying the impression that he was all for peace and goodwill. Once, in looking away from his notes, he was betrayed into taunting Mr. Asquith with having spoken from a brief. Immediately, however, Mr. Chamberlain seemed to regret the expression. "I mean," he observed apologetically, "that the right hon. gentleman was speaking from information supplied by one side only." The apology was a proof alike of the Colonial Secretary's ability to distinguish between what he calls plain speech and offensive innuendo and of his determination to make as many friends as possible even at the sacrifice of a gibe. On Monday night, on the other hand, when the interests of a Birmingham institution were in question, the natural man rose in revolt, and Birmingham's ex-Mayor stood revealed as a past-master in the gentle art of making enemies.

If the speech on the Commonwealth Bill had been cut down by one-half it would probably have been twice as effective. The historical retrospect, although an admirable piece of condensation, proved a weariness to the senatorial flesh, with the result that Lord Selborne, seated in the Peers' Gallery, dared the displeasure of his chief by falling asleep in view of the whole House. Not less prominent in the audience, though more wideawake, were the Australian delegates. The faces of those gentlemen were a study when the Colonial Secretary, with many compliments to their personal ability, applied himself to the congenial task of proving that after all they were nothing more than the mouthpieces of a section of Colonial opinion. Mr. Chamberlain, following his own precedent in the earlier stages of the South African controversy, had set himself to collect an anthology of newspaper opinions adverse to the pretensions of the delegates. "I know of no better way of getting at the bottom of public feeling" was his ingenuous explanation. Mr. Barton and his colleagues visibly gasped as this glimpse of the new diplomacy was revealed to their unsophisticated vision.

Much disappointment was felt and has since been widely expressed at the perfunctory nature of the proposals outlined by Mr. Chamberlain in compensation for the deletion of the Appeal Clauses of the Bill. The suggested amalgamation of the Judicial Committee with the House of Lords for the purposes of an Imperial Court was relegated, evidently at the bidding of the Lord Chancellor, to the dim and distant future, and in the meanwhile the colonies were invited to send one representative each to sit and act with the Judicial Committee, fortified by a salary of £6,000 a year, and a peerage for life. Singularly enough, the Colonial Secretary had almost omitted to mention that India is to be included in this arrangement. The oversight was remedied in a parenthesis. "How many members from the Colonies?" demanded a supporter of the Government. "Four," replied Mr. Chamberlain, "one each from Australia, Canada, South Africa, and India." The principle of the scheme, as the right hon. gentleman admitted, is already embodied in an Act passed about five years ago and originally drafted by Lord Ripon. "Of course," observed the present Secretary for the Colonies with an eager desire to give honour where honour was due, "it was I who passed it." The inducements now added to the scheme, although bluntly described by one of the delegates as a bribe to the lawyers of Australia, may nevertheless have the effect of endowing it with a vitality not hitherto visible in its operation.

Apart from a vigorous onslaught by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman on the methods of Mr. Chamberlain's diplomacy and a masterly survey by Mr. Haldane of the constitutional aspect of the question, the discussion was somewhat commonplace. The real debate will begin next week on the second reading, and in Committee when, as the Liberal leader announced, the Opposition mean to propose amendments with the object of modifying the alterations proposed by the Government. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman has rarely spoken with more feeling than he did in denouncing the "open rebuff" which he declared had been inflicted by Mr. Chamberlain on the duly accredited representatives of the Australian people. The methods of the right hon. gentleman, he indignantly asserted, were those of an eager, local, political partisan, and not what might have been expected from a calm and impartial British Minister dealing with the constitutional aspirations of a group of loyal and progressive colonies. True to his self-denying ordinance Mr. Chamberlain preserved an unnatural silence during the castigation. It was Mr. Balfour who winced and who shouted "No, no!" and "Oh, oh!" as the blows fell fast and faster. But Mr. Chamberlain made one or two little notes in a miniature diary. When next he speaks on the Bill those memoranda will probably make more impression than Mr. Balfour's agonised monosyllables.

For ten minutes on Tuesday Mr. Chamberlain ransacked his vocabulary in search of fresh terms of abuse to heap on the devoted heads of the Charity Commission. The floodgates were opened, and the torrent flowed with impetuous violence. Mr. Grant Lawson, a steady-going Tory and the Parliamentary spokesman of the Charity Commission, had had the temerity to poke fun at the local patriotism of Birmingham. The people of that town were promoting a Bill to emancipate their Grammar School from the financial control of the Charity Commissioners. What possessed Mr. Grant Lawson to seize on this proposal as the text of a parable on the political encroachments of the Liberal Unionists only he himself could say. Perhaps it was the spectacle—always exasperating to the excellent Conservatives who are still waiting for official promotion—of Mr. Chamberlain entrenched on the Treasury bench, flanked by his relatives and henchmen. Those "upright and honourable and right honourable men" were sarcastically congratulated on their influence in the House of Commons, were reminded, *apropos de bottes*, that popularity was but a fleeting breath, and informed that generations yet unborn would have more cause to bless the Charity Commission than to thank the wise men of "that great place, Birmingham."

Dearly did Mr. Grant Lawson pay for his flight of satire. He himself was not assailed personally, but the body of which he is the chosen and official champion was fairly bespattered with abuse. The Commissioners were told—just as if they had been a mere continental Power—that they must be taught a lesson. "This precious Commission," observed the ex-Mayor of Birmingham, instinctively reverting to the dialectical style of his Republican youth, "consists of three gentlemen and a certain number of clerks who think that every trumpery tinpot detail must be submitted to their revision. Their red-tape arrangements would astonish a Government office. It is against the ridiculous interposition of so incompetent a body that the people of Birmingham protest. Some people don't know the Charity Commission. We in Birmingham do know it, and we don't want to know it any more." The self-revelation of this little speech was complete. Sometimes the temper is repressed, but it is always there, and its influence may generally be traced in the dealings of the Colonial Secretary, not only with other men and in questions of local importance, but in great affairs of State. Needless to say, Mr. Chamberlain easily vanquished the petty Tory rising, and vindicated the right of Birmingham Home Rule.

Talk of an early dissolution is again agitating the Parliamentary lobbies. Every twenty miles in the advance of Lord Roberts towards Pretoria seem to bring us a month nearer to the end of this Parliament. At all events, that is the impression one derives from the political gossips. If Pretoria is occupied before the end of June the Government, we are told, will hastily submit their proposals for the future administration of the two Republics, invite the House of Commons to endorse the scheme by a vote of confidence, and failing a hearty acceptance of the settlement on the part of the Opposition will straightway make an appeal to the constituencies. Some such plan of campaign has already been outlined by the Colonial Secretary, and sooner or later it will probably be adopted. But Lord Roberts is still a long way from Pretoria. Our prophets should at least refrain from prediction until our soldiers have crossed the Vaal.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

LORD CURZON'S FIRMNESS.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, April 28.

The week has been made memorable by the publication of two important Resolutions by the Government of India, having reference to recent miscarriages of justice. Both the Chupra case and the Sibold case have been reviewed by the Government. With regard to the former, the facts are now too well known to need recapitulation. The publication of the full text of the judgment of Mr. Pennell created a profound sensation in the country. Both Anglo-Indian and Indian journals animadverted on the conduct of the erring officials who in their executive capacity as magistrates strove to stifle justice. The judgment revealed a gross case of abuse of magisterial authority which needed some strong remonstrance from the central authority. But at first it allowed the Provincial Government to dispose of the matter, which had evoked such unanimous hostile criticism from the Press. This had become evident after interpellations had been put in the Bengal Legislative Council by the Hon. Mr. Surendranath Banerjea. As a result some mild rebuke was administered to the erring magisterial trinity. But the central authority did not deem it sufficiently strong. So it took upon itself to review the case. No doubt the promptitude which has been displayed in the matter is owing to the keen desire of the Viceroy himself to put his Government straight in the eyes of the people. He did not in any way wish to condone the offence of the executive officials who so discreditably endeavoured to interfere with the cause of justice, and in doing so brought discredit on their Government also. It speaks volumes for Lord Curzon that he was able to impress his personality on the matter by calling for the papers and administering the rebuke which the case demanded. The Bengal Government expressed only its severe displeasure in the case of the senior official, and suspended the promotion for a year of the two subordinate ones. So the Indian Government, or rather Lord Curzon, was constrained to sit in judgment upon the attempt at whitewashing. Thus the Provincial Government itself has indirectly come in for a share of the castigation. That will prove an excellent lesson, which other provincial Governments will no doubt take to heart.

But there is a general consensus of opinion in the Indian Press that, though Lord Curzon displayed great courage in dealing with the case, thereby allaying to no inconsiderable extent the growing suspicion as to the impartiality and justice of British rule, he, too, has been somewhat wanting in the adjudication of the affair. The censure passed on the officials concerned and the action taken in reference to them is not so full as one might have expected from the stern principles laid down in the preamble of the Resolution. The *Bengalee* vigorously points out this little inconsistency.

The other side-issue is the one raised by the *Pioneer*. As befits the organ of the Civil Service, it questions the wisdom of the central authority in promulgating the Resolution to the world. It is angry that officials should be thus humiliated, and argues that such treatment will dishearten the Service. The cogency of this reasoning is not apparent. Does the *Pioneer* mean to imply that the distinguished service should be continuously praised in season and out of season? If praise of individual members is allowed to spread in the remotest corners of the globe, why should blame, whenever it is deserved, be not published also? Why a differential treatment? But Lord Curzon will have to be cautious. The Service and its recognised organs will never forget this incident.

The other Resolution refers to the Punjab case which had to be argued out in the High Court of Bengal, on its appellate side, at the instance of the Government of India itself, on the ground that the fine of Rs. 1,000 inflicted on the official who belaboured the poor Punjabi, with fatal result, was hardly commensurate with the weight of the recorded evidence. The accused was called upon by the Court to show cause why the punishment should not be enhanced. After argument, the Court decided that, in addition to the fine, the offender should be imprisoned for four months—the charge being culpable homicide not amounting to murder. Even this punishment is light. But it is something that here, too, Lord Curzon has intervened and saved the reputation of British justice. The Indian Press has nothing but unstinted praise for this courageous action of Lord Curzon.

Lastly, there is the *finale* of the Rangoon outrage case. The poor woman has been dead for some weeks past. She has not survived to hear that the great *Lat Sahib* was indignant, like any right-minded Englishman, at the infamous assault, and strove his best to award punishment to the higher officials concerned in the miscarriage of justice at the outset. The officers most concerned in that un-English drama have now met their deserts at the hands of the righteous Government of India. The regiment was some time ago degraded and packed off to Aden, and now one of the officers has been compelled to retire, and another sufficiently punished by being deprived of his staff appointment. This is as it should be.

Thus all the three cases which so scandalised the Government a few months ago have been disposed of to the satisfaction of the Indian people. Lord Curzon has contributed immensely to restore confidence and done his best to purify the administra-

tion of these blots which so much sullied British honour. The people are confident that so long as they have rulers of the righteousness and stern sense of justice of Lord Curzon, they can always rely on equality and impartiality before the law. More than by any other act his lordship has thus won the affection of the people. No wonder his action is praised and feelings of gratitude have been freely and unreservedly expressed.

The Viceroy has now made his tour up to the borders of Kandahar—100 miles within the boundaries of the Amir. He has had to give a good lecture to the Beluchis and their Chiefs. His Excellency means well. He did not mince matters, but told them that in proportion as they loyally aided in keeping quietude on the Western border of Beluchistan, they would reap the reward of friendship. It is sound policy to conciliate all border chiefs from one end of the Indus to the other. In this policy of mutual confidence and mutual aid lies the safety and happiness of both. Had such a policy been in the ascendant during the feeble rule of Lords Lansdowne and Elgin, India might have been saved the acquisitions behind the Hindu-Kush and the pyrrhic victories in Chitral and Tirah. The resumption of the old broad lines of the Lawrentian policy, modified only by the circumstances of the day, is having a salutary influence on the politics and finances of the Empire at large. And it will be a day of rejoicing when Lord Curzon can lay down the further lines of policy in relation to all the frontier and trans-frontier States whereby India may be saved perennial unrest on the borders and crores of wasteful expenditure. Lord Curzon has before him a brilliant future—a career of domestic reforms which may leave behind him a monument more durable than bronze. The famine is no doubt absorbing all his attention, but it is to be hoped that anxiety on that account may be allayed by an abundant rainfall during the coming monsoon six or seven weeks hence. Should that anxiety disappear, he would be free to devote his great energy and capacity to the solution of the burning agricultural problem on the broadest foundations—a solution which would relieve the rayat from his present condition of chronic impoverishment and enable him to live in fair prosperity. The prevention of famine is the problem of problems. It is admitted that the famine is a question of means more than food. How to provide the means is the problem. It is to be hoped that Lord Curzon will in this connexion endeavour, with an open mind uninfluenced by the plausibilities of the bureacracy, study the question of the poverty of India. In that case he can hardly fail to arrive at the conclusion that each and every economic evil of India has its root in that cause of causes, the perennial drain of the wealth of India to England with no hope of return. Stop this bleeding, even to a limited extent, and India will revive. All other panaceas, even fair revenue assessments, will be so many makeshifts and palliatives.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

5,579,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received (May 14) the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine:—

The decline in the number of persons demanding relief in Bombay and elsewhere is probably due to outbreak of cholera, which has broken up many relief camps, and enormously increased difficulties of our famine officers. Otherwise situation unaltered. Number of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,291,000; Punjab, 158,000; Central Provinces, 1,785,000; Berar, 398,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 124,000; Rajputana States, 467,000; Central India States, 166,000; Bombay Native States, 601,000; Baroda, 88,000; North-Western Provinces, 2,000; Punjab Native States, 25,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 65,000; Hyderabad, 379,000; Madras, 16,000; Kashmir, 1,000; Bengal, 3,000. Total, 5,579,000.

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers amounted on Wednesday night to £240,300. The Lord Mayor during the day remitted a further sum of £15,000 to Lord Curzon for relief purposes.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (May 12) of the *Investors' Review*:—

Subjoined is the list and amount of subscriptions received for our little fund up to date. May we again repeat that it is a fund, every farthing of which will be put to good uses, especially in helping the starved cultivators to replace their lost cattle, and that the more help we can give in this direction the sooner will the distressed provinces and Native States—for they cannot be forgotten in the present misery—recover some of their ancient prosperity? Cheques and postal orders should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, crossed Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

	£	s.	d.
Amount acknowledged last week	522	17	6
John Davidson, Esq., Friockheim	1	1	0
M. P. and A. ditto ditto	0	5	0
George Metcalfe, Esq., London, E.C.	10	0	0
J. F. M., Aberdeen	1	4	0
Miss M. C. Fellows	0	10	0
J. F. P., Perth	10	0	0
S. B. Slack, Esq., Dawlish	1	1	0
Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton, Nottingham	5	0	0
Total to date	£551	18	6

Remittances should be made to Mr. A. J. Wilson, *Investors' Review* office, Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.

Imperial Parliament.

Tuesday, May 8.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was now prepared in accordance with his intimations in previous Sessions, to lay upon the Table the Correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Government of India in relation to the Indian Public Works Department, particularly in regard to memorials of 1899-90 from the civil engineers:

And, whether he would lay upon the Table the Government of India's despatch, P.W.D., No. 10 d 30-3-99.

Lord G. HAMILTON: A correspondence on the subject of my hon. friend's question is still proceeding, and I am unable at present to say when I shall be able to lay papers on the Table of the House.

FINANCIAL LETTER.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was prepared to grant as an unopposed Return, Financial Letter No. 254, dated 20th July, 1899, from his Excellency the Governor General of India in Council.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The letter to which my hon. friend's question refers forms part of a correspondence, which is at present incomplete. The document in question will form part of the correspondence published when completed.

Friday, May 11.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Estimate),—Copy presented,—of Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for 1899-1900, compared with the results of 1898-9 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 172.]

East India (Finance and Revenue Accounts),—Copy presented,—of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1898-9 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Home Accounts),—Copy presented,—of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 173.]

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.
MORTALITY IN NATIVE STATES.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the mortality in Native States in consequence of the Famine, and especially in the districts of Rajputana, Godhra, and Baroda, and what measures, if any, had been taken to prevent it:

And, whether he would consider the advisability of having British officials appointed to superintend the arrangements for Famine Relief in Native States whenever practicable.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The mortality in the Native States is, I am sorry to say, considerably in excess of that occurring in British territory. British officers have in many cases been lent to advise and assist the Native Governments of the States, and loans have been and will continue to be made by the Indian Government to meet the expense of famine operations in territories outside British rule.

THE MADRAS HIGH COURT.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that the Government of Madras had recently departed from the usual practice in the appointment of the successor

of Sir S. Subramania Aiyer (at present on leave) as Judge of the Madras High Court:

And whether he would state whether there were any special reasons for not appointing an Indian judge, as usual, under such circumstances.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The appointment of an acting judge of the Madras High Court is vested by Act of Parliament in the Governor of Madras in Council. I have no information as to the reasons which guided that Government in the exercise of their discretion.

STORAGE AND IRRIGATION WORKS.

Mr. PRICE asked the Secretary of State for India whether there were certain Government surveys made in the district of Alibagh with the object of laying out certain storage and irrigation works:

And whether any works had been or could be usefully undertaken as the result of such surveys.

Lord G. HAMILTON: No Government surveys have been made in the Alibagh district for storage and irrigation works.

The district is unsuitable for irrigation from reservoirs, and the rainfall being heavy, storage is unnecessary.

Monday, May 14.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE CHUPRA CASE.

THE UNION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES.

Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY called the attention of the House to an article in the *Law Times* of January 13 on the Indian Executive and the Judiciary, and to the evils of uniting judicial and executive functions, as exemplified in the Chupra case; and to the insufficient action of the Bengal Government with respect to those that did well and those that did ill in that case. He said: This case does not require much comment, the article of the *Law Times* having supplied enough. From the precedents set in regard to enquiry as to military outrages, it may be expected that I shall be told, and that the House will be told, that these civilian outrages did not take place: if so the India Office will have to make it good by prosecuting the *Law Times* for libel, since its statements if not true are the most discrediting statements ever made of any administration. I regret to find that the editor of the *Law Times*, Mr. Crump, died about ten days ago; so he has escaped prosecution. One of the chief objects in calling the attention of the House to this case is because of the light it casts upon the evils of uniting executive and judicial functions. When I brought this subject before the House on May 8, 1893, both the then Secretary of State for India (Lord Kimberley) and his predecessor (Viscount Cross) were fully conscious of the necessity of a reform to remedy these evils. At that time it was supposed that financial difficulties stood in the way of reform. Financial difficulties are more likely to increase than to diminish; but since then, some Hindu gentlemen, in accord I believe with Sir Richard Garth, a former Chief Justice of Calcutta, had devised a scheme of redistribution of officials and of official duties which would have secured the object aimed at without any important additions to the expense of the administration. With regard to the notice as to the inadequate dealing with the case by the Bengal Government, the dismissal from the Service would appear to be what would have been expected for Mr. Twidell, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Simkins, and Mr. Corbett. Mr. Bourdillon, who tried to influence the Sessions Judge, does not appear even to have been censured, but promoted to be Chief Secretary to the Bengal Government. He is near his retirement from the Service, so cannot plead youthful inexperience. It would be adequate and just that the period for his retirement should be immediate. The too pliant deputy magistrate, Moulvi Zakir Hussein, should also retire upon his pension without delay. What compensation has been or will be made to the constable Narsingh for his illtreatment, and what reward should be given him for upholding the credit of the Indian Government in respect of abolition of forced labour? How long is the Sessions Judge, Mr. Pennell, to be left in an unhealthy post, to which he was appointed shortly after pronouncing his judgment? The *Law Times* calls this appointment an insidious side-blow at the impartial administration of justice. The Secretary of the Bengal Government denied that this appointment had been made on account of the judgment, but that it had been made before they had seen th judgment. A writer quoted in INDIA, under the signature of an "Englishman," says this is a quibble and that they knew of the judgment though they might not have seen it. In any case, by this time everybody has seen and may have read the judgment. How is it, then, that the Sessions Judge who has upheld the credit of the administration of British justice and law has not been removed from Noakhali or promoted by the Bengal Government, or by the Indian Government, or by order of the Secretary of State for India?

The EARL of ONSLOW said the case had received a great deal of attention in India, and when brought to the notice of the Government of India they thought fit to animadvert upon it in very severe terms. It was a matter of great regret that this assault had been committed and also that the punishment which had been awarded was hardly adequate to meet the case. It was also unfortunate that the Judge before whom the appeal was heard should have expressed his opinion on the case in terms not usually expected from one in a judicial position. Steps had been taken which it was hoped would prevent a recurrence of the incident; but it was not in accordance with the practice of India or of this country to grant compensation, and there was no information at the India Office that such compensation was in contemplation.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

THE PROMISED "ADVANCES."

Lord SANDHURST asked the Under-Secretary for India whether it was intended that the advances to the Indian rayats suffering from famine mentioned by the Secretary of State for India in a speech reported in the *Times* of May 10 shall be by way of loan or gift. In the course of that speech Lord George Hamilton said that a large portion of those charitable funds had been devoted to making advances to the rayat, the cultivator, and so had enabled him to buy seed and stock that he might once more, when the famine was over, be set on his legs. He assumed it was intended that the advances should be gifts and not loans, but on the one hand more than one present understood that, as the word "advanced" was used, loans were intended. He hoped the noble earl would be able to remove the ambiguity. The present famine in the Bombay Presidency was one of unexampled severity. He greatly feared that, if the aid was to be by loan, the very poorest would be unable to avail themselves of it while those only a shade less poor would greatly add to their existing embarrassments. The particular direction in which he was anxious to see assistance given was towards providing cattle, the mortality amongst which had been immense. He thought that a case had been made out for free gifts. After his experience he was under great apprehension as to what might be the result if aid could not be given. As that was the first occasion on which he had addressed the House since his return he wished to acknowledge the consideration and courtesy he had received from the noble earl and Lord George Hamilton. He could not help thinking, in conclusion, that the way in which relief had been given would be the means of bringing Europeans and Natives closer together than they had been for years.

The Earl of ONSLOW said he must acknowledge the manner in which the noble lord had met the difficulties of a very troublesome time, and it would be impossible for any Secretary of State not to sympathise with the noble lord in the extremely difficult task before him while he was Governor of Bombay or with his noble friend Lord Elgin, who was Viceroy at the time of the approach of the famine which was without precedent in the history of this generation. The Government of India had undertaken the duty of giving work to every man who applied for it without any enquiry, provided he stated that he was in a destitute condition. Beyond that, in the circumstances, no Government was entitled to go. But there were certain things which charitable funds might do. These things had been set out by Lord Elgin, and they were four in number. First of all, there were sums of money provided from charitable sources which might be applied to giving some additional comforts to weaker members of the community, such as medicines; secondly, to giving relief to those who from reasons of caste or prejudices might be unwilling to present themselves at the relief works; thirdly, in taking charge of orphans; and, lastly, and most important of all, of setting on their legs again those who had been supported on relief works in order that on the conclusion of the famine they might resume their normal occupations, agricultural and other. The noble lord asked whether this advance was to be in the form of a loan or a gift. His answer was both or either. That was to say the Government of India intended to provide a very large sum of money to supplement what might be available from charitable funds. The funds would be applied for supplying the necessary seeds, stock, etc., to the rayats for carrying on their operations. The scheme under which these advances were to be made are not yet completely settled. The Viceroy was in communication with the local Governments and would advise the Secretary of State as to the final shape which the policy should take. But he could say that there would be no interest charged upon these advances; and under any circumstances, they would not be repayable for at least a year, and repayment would probably be spread over a considerable time. The utmost latitude would be reserved to the Indian Government to remit, altogether or in part, repayment of the advances made to the rayats; and they would take into consideration the circumstances of each case. It was hoped that such measures would avoid, on the one hand, any tendency to pauperisation by too lavish a grant of free gifts, and, on the other hand, the infliction of any hardship in reference to repayment. The Government of India hoped that they would be able to set on their legs again the great majority of those who were now suffering from a famine such as had never been known before in India, and who without help would find it difficult to resume their normal occupations. It was also hoped that, within a reasonable time after the famine had come to an end, the land revenue of the Government would be restored. (Hear, hear.)

Viscount CROSS wished to thank the noble lord for the testimony which he had borne to the action both of the civil and military officers under circumstances of very great trial and difficulty. (Hear, hear.) That testimony would give great satisfaction both in this country and in India.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE IMPORTATION OF SUGAR.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India if he could now give the complete returns of the importation of sugar into India for the financial year 1899—1900, as compared with the figures for the five years immediately preceding, specifying the quantities of beet and cane sugar respectively, and the shipments from colonial and from foreign ports.

Lord G. HAMILTON: No, sir; the Indian trade returns for March, 1900, have not yet reached me; I expect to receive them about the end of the present month.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

PROPOSED NATIONAL GRANT.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India, what was the aggregate number, according to the last Official Return, of men as well as of the cattle lost through the effects of the present famine in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received no official return of the number of human lives or of cattle lost through the effects of the present famine in India, nor would it be desirable, under existing circumstances, to call upon the Indian Government for such statistics. When the famine is over it may be possible to form an estimate of the various forms of loss, but it could not be more than an estimate.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether any reply had been received to the communication addressed by him to the Government of India with the view of supplementing the amounts subscribed to the Mansion House and

other voluntary famine funds by a National Grant, so as to place at the disposal of that Government an adequate sum for the purpose of making advances to the rayats and for supplying them with cattle, seeds, implements, and other necessaries for carrying on agricultural operations with the next rainfall.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India intend to provide a large sum by way of supplement to what will be available from the the various charitable funds, for supplying the rayats in the famine districts with cattle, seeds, and other necessaries for carrying on agricultural operations. The details of the scheme are not yet completely settled, but the assistance to be given to the cultivators will probably take the form of advances without interest, repayable by instalments not to begin for a year from the present time, and with power to the local governments to make large remissions, thus converting the advances or a portion of them into gifts, as circumstances may require.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had now informed the Viceroy that her Majesty's Government was willing to supplement the grants made for famine relief by the Government of India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The statement I have made to the Viceroy is the same that I have made to the House—that if the Government of India found that the financial resources at their disposal were insufficient to enable them to adequately discharge the obligations they have undertaken for the relief of distress caused by famine, they could rely upon help from the Imperial Government.

Tuesday, May 15.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

Colonel MILWARD asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could give the House any information as to the progress of the famine in India, and as to the necessity of further assistance to the Lord Mayor's Fund.

LORD G. HAMILTON: According to the latest telegram there were 5,579,000 persons on the Relief Works in India. This figure is slightly lower than that of the previous week, but the reduction must not be taken as indicating any general improvement in the state of affairs, as it is probably owing to the breaking up of some of the relief camps which have been visited by cholera. In Madras and Mysore, however, the recent rain has caused a material improvement of the situation in those localities, elsewhere the position is unaltered. As regards the Mansion House and other similar funds, in 1897 more than half the money contributed by charity was spent in making advances to the cultivators to enable them to resume their livelihood, and the funds so raised were largely in excess of the response to the similar appeal made during the present year. The Government of India, as I explained in reply to a question yesterday, are making provision to supplement this branch of relief by making large advances themselves to the cultivators.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

THE MINORITY REPORT.

The following is the text of the Minority Report (which is signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine) continued from page 231 of our last issue:—

57. Table II shows the increase or decrease in the principal heads of expenditure for the different periods shown in Table I.

TABLE II.

Increase (+) or Decrease (—) in Net Expenditure of Government in India.

	1875-6 to 1884-5.	1884-5 to 1895-6.	1875-6 to 1895-6.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue.	+661,559	+1,311.411	+1,972.970
II. Civil Services	+2,691.567	+5,829,004	+8,520.571
III. Military Services ..	+1,092,085	+8,619 869	+9,711.954
IV. Debt Services	—338,886	—688,101	—1,026.987
V. Commercial Services ..	—976.478	—27,133	—1,003,611
VI. Special Services ..	+1,180,148	—1,217,712	—37,564
	+4,309 995	+13,827 338	+18,137.333

58. To this table we think it advisable to add the figures for 1898-9, the closed accounts of which have recently reached England. The figures here given are taken for the most part from the Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1898-9 published in Calcutta in January, 1900, and in a few cases of special detail from other specified sources.

59 To stop the consideration of Indian finance at the year 1895-6 in a Report dated 1900, besides being out of date, is open to the very serious objection that since 1895-6 the great rise in exchange has entirely changed the prospects of Indian Government finance since that year. Consequently to draw conclusions based on the figures of 1895-6 is to deal with unrealities.

How great is the effect produced by the rise in exchange since 1895-6 is disclosed by the following figures taken from the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for 1899 at page 17:—

		Exchange.
Total net charge 1895 6	..	Rx. 13,990 900
,, (Rev. Est.) 1898-9	..	9,253,600
Saving to Government of India		Rx. 4,737,300

For 1899-1900 exchange promises to be even better, the average rate being slightly above the 16d. at which it was taken for last year. It is probable that from this cause the saving to the Government of India as compared with 1895-6 is now about Rx. 5,000,000 a year.

Fall in exchange is certainly one of the marked characteristics of the period 1884-5 to 1895-6. That fall induced a net additional charge on the Government of India of Rx. 10,455,000. But if the period be brought up to date by taking the years 1884-5 to 1898-9 the net additional charge becomes Rx. 5 717,700 (Rx. 10,455,000—Rx. 4,737,300), or little more than half this amount.

It would follow that a consideration of this fact must materially affect any inferences to be drawn from the figures for increase of exchange given in paras. 115 and 116 of our colleagues' Report. We venture to submit that those figures have little practical value as an indication of the present condition of Indian finance, and that, therefore, they are apt to be misleading if left to stand alone.

60. The following table shows in abstract form the net expenditure of the Government of India for 1898-9, compared with that in 1884-5:—

TABLE III.

Net Expenditure of the Government of India.

	1884-5.	1898-9.	Increase (+) or Decrease (—).
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue.	5,116,137	6,453,762	+1,337,625
II. Civil Services	17.221.066	24,600.533	+7,379,467
III. Military Services ..	17.057,865	24,245.036	+7,187,171
IV. Debt Services	3.907,848	1,972.509	—1,935.339
V. Commercial Services..	2.065 975	427.975	—1,638,000
VI. Special Services ..	1,811.858	1,188 767	—623,091
Total	47,180,749	58.888,582	+11,707,833

Military Expenditure.

61. The most striking fact in these tables is the increase in the expenditure on the army in the period 1884-5 to 1895-6. Not only does the increase of more than Rx 8,500.000 during those eleven years far exceed the increase under any other head of expenditure, but it affords in itself a sharp contrast with the increase of army expenditure during the period from 1875-6—1884-5. The remarkable nature of this contrast may be set out as follows:—

Increase in Indian Military Expenditure.

		Rx.	
From 1875-6 to 1884-5	..	1,092 085, or 7 5 per cent.	
,, 1884-5 ,, 1895-6	..	8,619,869, ,, 60 5	,,

62. These figures, however, are affected by the fall in exchange, especially for the years 1884-5 to 1895-6. The following figures show the progress of the net military expenditure of the Government of India from 1875-6 to 1898-9, distinguishing the net cost of exchange in any form, whether on the remittance of the Home Charges, or the sterling pay of British troops, or on Exchange Compensation Allowance.

Net Military Expenditure of the Indian Government.

	1875-6.	1884-5.	1895-6.	1898-9.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Total Net Charges ..	15,965,780	17,057,865	25,677,734	24,245,036
*Deduct Net Exchange	381,672	1,134,829	4,890,998	3,170,286
Net Cost (excluding Exchange) ..	15,584,108	15,923,036	20,786,736	21,074,750

* The following are the detailed figures for Exchange connected with the Military Services (see official accounts for the years stated):—

	Rx.
1875-6—Expenditure	393 437
Deduct Receipts	—11,765
Net Charge	381,672
1884-5—Expenditure	966,984
Deduct Receipts	—16,455
Add sterling pay of troops	+184,300
Net Charge	1.134,829
1895-6—Expenditure	3,200,145
Deduct Receipts	—57,216
Add sterling pay of troops	+1,156,400
,, Exchange Compensation	+591,669
Net Charge	4,890 998
1898-9—Expenditure	2,206,578
Deduct Receipts	—28,682
Add sterling pay of troops	+778.400
,, Exchange Compensation	+213,990
Net Charge	3,170,286

		Rx.	%
Increase (Exchange (excluded) ..	1875-6 to 1884-5 ..	338 928,	or 2 2
	1884-5 ,, 1895-6 ..	4,863,700,	,, 30·6
	1884-5 ,, 1898-9 ..	5 151,714,	,, 32·4
	1875-6 ,, 1898-9 ..	5,490,642,	,, 35·2

63. It is obvious that the change from an increase of a little over two per cent. in nine years to one of over 30 per cent. in eleven years, or of 32½ per cent. in fourteen years, represents something more than the normal increase of expenditure due to the progress of Government. An examination of the facts leaves no doubt as to the cause of this great increase. The evidence does not point to wastefulness as an important cause of increase. The essential cause was policy. We are precluded from discussing that policy on the merits, but it seems necessary to trace how the growth of expenditure has depended upon the view taken of the needs of external defence. Sir Auckland Colvin has indicated the year 1885 as the time when a definite change took place in the frontier policy of the Government of India. That year saw the close of the Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, and the beginning of a period when great preponderance was given to military considerations and when the idea of "greater military preparedness" on the North-West Frontier dominated the financial policy of the Government of India. The change was at once followed by an increase of 10,000 European and 20,000 Native troops, necessitating an annual increase of about Rx. 1,600,000 in the expenditure of the country. The increase was effected in spite of an earnest protest on the part of the Finance Minister and another member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and in disregard of the Report of the Army Commission, which a short time previously declared that the then existing strength of the Army was quite adequate to the military needs of the country, including the "contingency of operations beyond the frontier not merely against Russia with Afghanistan as our ally, but against Russia assisted by Afghanistan." It was pointed out by the dissenting members at the time that the increased strength would probably lead to aggressive enterprises; and the anticipation was almost immediately verified. A few months after the increase had been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, Upper Burma was invaded, conquered, and annexed to the Indian Empire, in spite of protests of Indian public opinion, which feared that the annexation would be financially harmful to India. That this fear was well founded is shown by the fact that during the eleven years 1885-6 to 1895-6 the Government of India spent a net amount of nearly Rx. 15 000,000 in the new Province on account of special military expenditure and civil administration; and even now the annual charge may be estimated at Rx. 750,000. The following figures taken from an annual table (now discontinued) published in the explanatory memorandum of the Secretary of State for India for the years 1888-96, give the official estimate of this expenditure.

TABLE IV.

Military Expenditure in Upper Burma, 1885-6—1895-6.

Year.	Army.	Military Works	Total.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
1885-6............	631,000	—	631,000
1886-7..........	1,517,800	73,900	1,591,700
1887-8..........	1,475,300	314,300	1,789,600
1888-9..........	631,600	160,400	792,000
1889-90	435,800	139 800	575,600
1890-1..........	350,300	137,900	488 200
1891-2..........	529,200	123,100	652,300
1892-3..........	502,500	132,500	635 000
1893-4..........	458,200	145,148	603,348
1894-5..........	374,100	84,502	458,602
*1895-6..........	362,500	75,800	438,300
Total	7,268,300	1,387,350	8,655,650

* Revised Estimate.

Total Net Cost of Upper Burma, 1885-6—1895-6.

	Rx.
1885-6	631,000
1886-7	2,068,700
1887-8	2,618,300
1888-9	1,682,800
1889-90	1,331,000
1890-1	1,085,300
1891-2	1,361,100
1892-3	1,176,100
1893-4	1,082,846
1894-5	759,875
*1895-6	782,500
Total	14,579,521

* Revised Estimate.

The Bombay annual provincial conference came to an end at Satara on Monday. Resolutions were passed regretting recent modifications of famine policy which had increased the task and decreased wages beyond what was contemplated in the Famine Code. It was also regretted that the remission and suspension of land revenue had not been more liberal.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

On May 8 Miss A. Garland addressed the Darwen Liberal League on "The Famine in India." There was a moderate attendance and a strong resolution was passed unanimously desiring the English Government to give a substantial grant to the Famine Relief Fund.

On May 9 Miss Garland addressed a public meeting held in the Lecture Hall of the Liberal Club, Bacup. Mrs. Higgins presided, and a very hearty welcome was accorded to the lecturer on her safe return from her tour in India. A resolution asking for a Parliamentary grant towards the Famine Relief Fund was carried with acclamation.

On May 10 Miss Garland spoke at the Rusholme Town Hall to a crowded audience, who had gathered to hear addresses from the Liberal candidate, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. Augustine Birrell, M.P., Mr. Maddison, M.P. Miss Garland graphically described the famine-stricken districts, and the condition of the people. She pleaded for charity at present, but following that, for justice for the Indian people.

On May 11 Miss Garland addressed a well-attended meeting at Oakworth, and a good collection was taken for the famine.

On May 13 Miss Garland opened a debate on "The Causes of Famines in India," at the Socialist Society at Leeds. In the evening there was a large congregation assembled to hear her describe her visit to India. Collections in aid of the Famine Funds were taken.

The text of the resolution of the Darwen meeting referred to above is thus given in the *Darwen News* of May 12:—

That this meeting considers that a grant of several millions should be given by Parliament to the Indian Famine Relief Fund.

"The resolution," says the *Darwen News*, "was carried without a dissentient."

During the week Miss Garland has addressed meetings at Leek (May 14), at Sheffield (May 15), and at Hallam (May 15).

Further meetings will be held as follows:—

May 18. County Forum, Manchester.
,, 21. Wigan (W. L. A)
,, 22. Willaston (W. L. A.)
,, 23. S. Bristol.
,, 24. W. Bristol (Redland Hall).
,, 25. Street.
,, 28. Cardiff.

We take from the *Ilford Guardian* the following report of a meeting held on Monday, April 30:—

An adjourned debate on "Our Policy in India" took place in connexion with the Ilford Liberal Association on Monday evening last, when the association had secured the services of Mr. G. Parameswaram Pillai, B.A., editor of the *Madras Standard* and representative of the Indian National Congress. Mr. F. C. Grimwood occupied the chair, and introduced the speaker. Mr. Pillai's address was in English, and showed a wonderful command of a foreign language. At times he became really eloquent and carried his hearers with him in closest attention to the end. Speaking more especially as a representative of the Indian National Congress movement, Mr. Pillai of course dealt with Indian affairs from the Congress point of view, beginning, as an editor would, with the freedom of the Press. He showed that the recent Sedition Act had had a very bad effect in India, and was looked upon as a distinctly repressive and retrogressive measure. Mr. Pillai dealt fully with the question of land settlement and revenue, and with the closely allied subject of famine. He contended that the Hindu system of revenue—payment in produce—was more elastic than the system of payment in silver brought in by the British Government. The occurrence of famine on a large scale was attributed to over-assessment and hardness in the collection of the revenue. The work of the Indian Government in its heroic efforts to deal with the famine were praised, however, and the speaker said that Lord Curzon was looked upon as one of the most sympathetic Viceroys India had ever had. Full credit was given the Government for the good side of their work, and Mr. Pillai held that India was better off on the whole under England than she could be under any other European Power, or even if left to herself. A most interesting discussion followed, many useful questions being put to Mr. Pillai, and at the close admirably replied to by that gentleman. The speaker was cordially thanked on the motion of the chairman, and Mr. Pillai, who was delighted with his visit to Ilford, promised to come again if necessary before his return to India.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN BOOK.—No. III.

The Proposed Separation OF Judicial and Executive Duties in India.

MEMORIAL

FROM

Rt. Hon. Lord HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I. *(late Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).*

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD GARTH, Q.C. *(late Chief Justice of Bengal).*

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD COUCH *(late Chief Justice of Bengal, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).*

Sir CHARLES SARGENT *(late Chief Justice of Bombay.)*

Sir WILLIAM MARKBY, K.C.I.E. *(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta).*

Sir JOHN BUDD PHEAR *(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, and Chief Justice of Ceylon).*

Sir JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G. *(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).*

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P. *(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).*

Sir ROLAND K. WILSON, Bart. *(late Reader in Indian Law at the University of Cambridge).*

Mr. HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I. *(late Member of the Bengal Legislative Council).*

TOGETHER WITH TWO APPENDICES.

London: Published by THE BRITISH COMMITTEE of the INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price One Shilling (or 12 annas), postage 2d. extra.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., President.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

Soho Square, National Hospital, London, N.W.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies, Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions during the Autumn and Winter Season.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, THE SECRETARY,
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 *& 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.*

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

"THE LAWYER."

A MONTHLY legal publication containing a full index of all recent important cases decided by the four High Courts, the Chief Court of Punjab, Sindh Sadar Court, Oudh and Central Provinces commissioners, Royal Courts of Justice in England in all Branches, the Privy Council, House of Lords; and reported in the (1-4) Indian Law Reports Series; (5) the Calcutta Weekly Notes; (6) The Bombay Law Reporter; (7) Madras Law Journal; (8) Allahabad Weekly Notes; (9) Sindh Sadar Court Reports; (10) Punjab Law Reporter; (11) Central Provinces Reports; (12) Oudh select cases; (13-15) Law Reports (Q. B., Ch., A. C.); (16) Indian Appeals and non-legal publications as the Times of India and other Indian Publications. Legal news, anecdotes about Lawers, Scraps, Statutory changes. In short, in a small compass, the Journal gives the greatest information to Lawyers. In addition to this, interesting and important cases, old and new, are given *in extenso* with separate paging. Price Rs. 4 only, inclusive of postage. For specimen copies apply to the Manager, *The Lawyer*, Ahmedabad.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA,* 84 *and* 85, *Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.